

The Washington Times

Published Evening and Sunday.

FRANK A. MUNSEY

Daily, one year.....\$3.00 Sunday, one year.....\$2.50

The Times is served in the city of Washington and District of Columbia by newsboys, who deliver and collect for the paper on their own account at the rate of 6 cents a week for the Evening and 5 cents a copy for the Sunday edition.

Defining the Issue.

Under the heading "An Organ Out of Tune," the Evening Star yesterday printed an extraordinary editorial. The effect of it was, in part, not only to rank The Times as the new school superintendent's "own newspaper organ," "hitherto blind or indifferent to the facts," but to accuse The Times of an unwarrantable and slanderous attack upon the Star.

The designation which our contemporary significantly accepts was defined in The Times of Wednesday in these words:

Opposition to the new authorities created by the present school law developed at the outset in one certain quarter, and has been continued in that quarter alone. Before Dr. Chancellor could reach Washington he was condemned. Since that time he has been bitterly, almost maliciously attacked for not meeting 50,000 pupils of the system personally, for not providing courses of study, for going South to inspect advanced schools for colored youth, for a purpose to remove efficient teachers without reason or form, and for lobbying in Congress.

The words in which the Star picks up this shoe and puts it on are:

In joining at the eleventh hour, the ranks of Dr. Chancellor's critics, it (The Times) stirs the maelstrom of bitterness and the effectiveness of those who have preceded it in proclaiming in the public interest the truth concerning Dr. Chancellor. By unmistakable inference it accuses the Star of condemning Dr. Chancellor unheard before he had arrived in Washington, of attacking him, almost maliciously, on trivial or baseless pretenses, and of conducting against him an unsuccessful, because unworthy, campaign of misrepresentation.

While the Star warmly resents these contemptible slanders upon its motives, it is glad that they have at last found their way into print, so that they may be publicly branded. Heretofore they have been confined to the cowardly and irresponsible whisperings of certain slander peddlers with whom this community is cursed.

The Star is a newspaper of importance, influence, and usually of sense. It has such standing in the community that what it says cannot be lightly dismissed. That is the reason, and the only reason, why The Times gives the slightest notice to the charges published by its contemporary yesterday. It does not seek contention. It has from the first feared that a cause of the greatest possible importance to the community—the good of its public schools—might be endangered by a newspaper controversy which many believed to exist from the first but which The Times has carefully avoided.

Yet fairness and good faith are The Times' dearest possessions. It prefers the respect of the people of this community above anything and everything else. And these considerations make it necessary for The Times to take up seriously and earnestly the charge the Star has made.

It is essential that our readers shall at the outset understand the issue presented. In order that they may have it fully and conveniently before them, The Times reprints herewith the editorial which it published last Wednesday and that which appeared in The Star of yesterday.

With that it will be content until its readers have had opportunity to peruse and weigh unhampered the representations of the two papers. It will then make proper and sufficient answer to the charges of the Star.

Endangering a Good Cause Needlessly.

(From The Washington Times, Wednesday, December 26.)

Certain recent happenings affecting the District schools, particularly an interview with the superintendent, published in The Times of last Sunday, and a letter sent by him to the members of the Board of Education, impel this paper to break rather a long silence on school affairs.

When the present school law was approved by the President, The Times hoped the need for special activity on its part in school matters had passed. A reorganization which every interest of the system required had been accomplished; the pay of the teachers had been adjusted—in part, at least; needed educational inspiration was fairly to be expected; it had been made plain that the schools must be conducted for the good of the pupils, and no one else.

Under such circumstances the duty of this paper was to report the proceedings of the new officials without favor or prejudice, and comment upon them editorially only when special occasion demanded. That occasion has now arisen through a series of extremely unwise and regrettable outbursts from the new superintendent, of which the two indicated are the latest.

Opposition to the new authorities created by the present school law developed at the outset in one certain quarter, and has been continued in that quarter alone. Before Dr. Chancellor could reach Washington he was condemned. Since that time he has been bitterly, almost maliciously, attacked for not meeting 50,000 pupils of the system personally, for not providing courses of study, for going South to inspect advanced schools for colored youth, for a purpose to remove efficient teachers without reason or form, and for lobbying in Congress.

Practically all this criticism is utterly unfounded. It is an absurdity to ask the head of a system like that of Washington to meet 50,000 pupils individually. Courses of study, improved far beyond those of last year, had been promulgated at the opening of the term, and were in force at the very time this charge was published. The trip South was taken at the direction of the Board of Education, and it, not the superintendent, was responsible for the whole project. There has been no attempt to remove good reason to think the superintendent ever undertook to remove any teacher, save to fulfill a program of promoting the efficient and dismissing the inefficient as a competent pedagogue was able to judge the value of his subordinates. Inquiry at the Capitol fails to show the slightest substance to support the accusation that the superintendent offended there against any standard of good morals or good taste. A campaign along such lines was sure to fail. More than that, it was sure to enlist in support of the person attacked the sympathy of every clear-minded and earnest citizen. It has been decidedly gratifying, and it promised well for the whole cause of public education in the District, that the superintendent recognized this, and waited for the right to assert itself.

However, a new factor entered into the situation. Other authorities than the Board of Education and the superintendent came into contact, and conflict, with them as to the enforcement of the law. By its provisions—perhaps, unfortunately—the Commissioners had to rule upon certain expenditures of the board. Subsequently, the District Supreme Court had to pass upon the board's construction of the law in removing one of its subordinates.

Here there was special need for every connection with the schools to be maintained. The District Commissioners

are officially entitled to every show of respect; and in this case there was no reason whatever to believe that their action in regard to certain expenditures of the school fund would be otherwise than free from bias and entirely sincere. Similarly, but to a greater degree, it was needful to be consistently respectful to the court, whose impartiality was unquestioned, and whose interpretation of the law was the law until it was either reversed by an appellate court or repealed by Congress.

Neither the Board of District Commissioners nor the court has obtained this fair, elemental consideration at the hands of Dr. Chancellor. After enduring so much from other quarters quietly, he has—in the particular contingency instance calculated to work him most harm—not only talked a great deal, but talked impulsively, ill-advisedly, and inconsistently. In a statement concerning the Commissioners, he has assumed apparently that every official of the Government who disagreed with him was either ignorant or unfair. Now, in the interview indicated and in an official communication to the members of the board, he has upbraided the District Supreme Court, and in substance accused it of preferring technicality to justice.

It is not forgotten that Dr. Chancellor has been warrantly exasperated. He has encountered unmistakable disloyalty in his official force. He has been hampered by private interests strongly entrenched. Though he has given his whole heart to the betterment of our schools, practically everything he has done has been misrepresented. But surely the superintendent of schools ought to see clearly that these difficulties have no connection with the action of the Commissioners and the court. Surely, the superintendent of schools ought to see that even if he had such connection they could not condone the petulance and intemperance of his language. And the effect of his outbursts has been to give the opposition to him the only effective ammunition it has ever had to use against him.

The merits of the "Cardozo case," which was the matter reviewed by the court, do not enter into this discussion. Proceeding under advice from its counsel, the Board of Education took action looking to the dismissal of a supervisor, sufficient. The court has now declared null the proceedings adopted to that end, but it has not passed upon the charges. Either the board believed Mr. Cardozo to be unfit to remain in the service, or it acted willfully with gross injustice toward him. The latter hypothesis is hardly to be taken seriously. The board's duty, therefore, is to start anew under the law as interpreted by the court, try Mr. Cardozo, and either make effectual its finding as to him or develop unmistakably the inefficiency of the present law. In the meantime, it can, if it chooses, appeal from the judgment of the Supreme Court.

The question raised by the decision of the court is chiefly one of methods. But the issue precipitated by the exasperated outbursts from the superintendent of schools involves the welfare of the whole school system. He has, indeed, endangered the great work of reclaiming our District schools from the control of seekers after special privilege, from a condition of continued disorder, from the conflict of rings of school politicians. The persistent misrepresentation of the proceedings of the new authorities has been bad enough, but every friend of the purpose ex-

pressed in the new law, surely every friend of the new superintendent, must regret still more these costly and wholly unnecessary explosions on his part.

An Organ Out of Tune.

(From The Washington Times, December 27.)

The Washington Times, hitherto blind or indifferent to the facts, yesterday opened its eyes, discovered and announced Superintendent Chancellor's endangering "the welfare of the whole school system" by "exasperated outbursts," slurring unfairly the Commissioners and the District Supreme Court, that he has "talked impulsively, ill-advisedly and inconsistently;" that he has "assumed apparently that every official who disagreed with him was either ignorant or unfair;" and that "the petulance and intemperance of his language" were not to be condoned. The Times does not, however, make its belated confession of mistake with good grace. In joining at the eleventh hour the ranks of Dr. Chancellor's critics it slurs the motives and belittles the effectiveness of those who have preceded it in proclaiming in the public interest the truth concerning Dr. Chancellor. By unmistakable inference it accuses the Star of condemning Dr. Chancellor unheard before he had arrived in Washington, of attacking him, almost maliciously, on trivial or baseless pretenses, and of conducting against him an unsuccessful, because unworthy, campaign of misrepresentation.

While the Star warmly resents these contemptible slanders upon its motives, it is glad that they have at last found their way into print, so that they may be publicly branded. Heretofore they have been confined to the cowardly and irresponsible whisperings of certain slander peddlers with whom this community is cursed.

There is not a particle of truth in the charge that the Star has been ruled by malice or any unworthy motive in its criticisms of Dr. Chancellor. While it thought that the local educational problem, with all its peculiarities, could be worked out with better results by a local superintendent, than by any outsider (and recent experience has only strengthened and confirmed this belief) it did not condemn Dr. Chancellor before he came to Washington, but was prepared to give him the fair play that is due to every man. Every word of criticism which it has published has been in the public interest, with good motives, as legitimate comment upon the public acts and words of a public officer.

It is ridiculous for The Times to suggest that Dr. Chancellor has not been guilty of impulsive and ill-advised action and petulant and intemperate language, showing tactlessness and general unfitness to be superintendent of the public schools of the District of Columbia. Within three days after his arrival he had impulsively and ill-advisedly taken sides in factional disputes, misinterpreted the law to give him dictatorial control over every local teacher, and alarmed and unnerved the whole teaching force. Before he had even thought of a Southern trip he had demonstrated his view that anyone—teacher, parent, editor, member of Board of Education—who disagreed with him was "either ignorant or unfair," either a fool or a knave; and he had displayed not once, but many times in discussing the fool or knave aforesaid "the petulance and intemperance of language" with which The Times now tardily brands him. He has been so since the beginning that he was yesterday and is today.

It may be admitted, however, that so inconceivably tactless and unwise have been the superintendent's utterances that the public would have found difficulty in believing that he had not been misrepresented in respect to them if he had not been quoted verbatim in his own newspaper organs and had not repeated his self-disciplined verbal assaults in an official document given out by him for publication prior to his submission to the Board of Education.

Clearly it is not now for the first time that Dr. Chancellor has threatened the welfare of the whole school system. He did it at the moment when he hastily adopted and acted upon the view that all the teachers had been vacated by the law; he did it when he assumed that any one who disagreed with him on this point (or on any point) was either ignorant or malicious, and on this assumption slurred the motives of honest critics in and out of the school system; he did it when he assumed unlimited power to dismiss teachers abruptly, arbitrarily, without a trial, and by an "exasperated outburst" coerced the Board of Education into consenting to his lawlessness.

The Star has always been the well-wisher and helper of the teachers. It has always labored to right wrongs and to remedy injustices inflicted upon them, either individually or collectively. It was one of the strongest forces to aid them in the campaign for increased pay. It fought to give them living salaries to retain our efficient force in Washington in spite of the temptation to seek or accept higher paid positions in other places. When the law, for the enactment of which it had worked as a blessing to the teachers, and by an "exasperated outburst" coerced the Board of Education into consenting to his lawlessness, it found it to give them living salaries to retain our efficient force in Washington in spite of the temptation to seek or accept higher paid positions in other places. When the law, for the enactment of which it had worked as a blessing to the teachers, and by an "exasperated outburst" coerced the Board of Education into consenting to his lawlessness, it found it to give them living salaries to retain our efficient force in Washington in spite of the temptation to seek or accept higher paid positions in other places.

The Star's campaign in behalf of fair play for the teachers individually and collectively has not been a failure. Its view of the status of the teachers, as a continuous force, at first rejected disastrously, has been accepted and acted upon, saving many official lives, by the board and the superintendent himself; its opinion concerning the teachers' right of trial has been approved by the court and was yesterday accepted by the board notwithstanding the superintendent had overruled the court; and its opinion that Dr. Chancellor's superintendency is injurious to the teachers and the schools, based upon his total misconception of the relation of his office to the Commissioners, Congress, the courts, the teachers, and the Board of Education, and upon his vanity, his ungovernable temper and his lack of tact, is now entertained by the Star "even, by nearly everybody in Washington," including since yesterday the long-faithful Times itself.

It is not too soon to begin to plan to do next year's Christmas shopping early.

Forget the Weather and Head for His



THE SILK HAT.

Here we have a Silk Hat Child. You know a Silk Hat is to Wear on one's Head, but there is More to Learn about this Shim-mering piece of Head Fur-nish-ing. A Silk Hat is what St. Louisans wear in the Morning, Chicagoans wear in the After-noon and New York Res-i-dents of the Male Per-sua-sion Sleep In. Man-y a Silk Hat, Little Ones, covers a Cheese-Cloth Brain. A Silk Hat is the Pi-ous Brother-of the Op-e-ra Hat and man-y a Silk Hat is Crushed In after the Wear-er has had Nine High Ones, be-cause he thinks it is an Op-e-ra Hat. Rem-ber lit-tle Boys, you can never be Great when you grow Up un-less you wear a Silk Hat.

PALM ROOM.

"Come into the palm room with me." "Why, the isn't the palm room; it is the dining room."

"Well, don't you see all these waiters here with upturned palms?"

LUCKY.

"Gee, Smithers is a lucky fellow!" "How so?"

"Why, his wife actually takes as much care of him as she does of the rubber plant."

DISCORDANT MIRTH.

Miss Goodley—That young widow certainly has a happy disposition. Miss Knox—Yes, but there's such a thing as carrying a happy disposition too far.

Miss Goodley—How, for instance?

Miss Knox—Well, by laughing at one's husband's funeral.



There was a little man And he had a little dun Which he showed to the debtor and read, read, read; When the debtor paid, The shock of it made The poor man with the dun fall down dead, dead, dead!

NO REST FOR HIM.

Cassidy—Hello, Casey, how's things wld ye these days? Casey—O busy, very busy, indeed. Casey—Ye don't tell me? Casey—Aye. Sure I've time I'm at layure I hoo somethin' to do.

TOO MUCH JOY.

"I saw Peckham today," said Nagget, "and he was just as drunk as he could be." "Well," replied Mrs. Nagget, "there's some excuse for him. He lost his wife last week."

"I know, but a man should be able to celebrate without making a pig of himself."

HASTY JUDGMENT.

"Gracious! George," exclaimed Mrs. Newliffe, "how you do snore at night!" "It's demerol," said the husband, "how do you know?"

"Why, I hear you."

"My dear, you mustn't believe everything you hear."

IT DOES SEEM STRANGE.

Browne—So you think the Bible is contradictory in spots? Henpeck—Er, yes, I do. Browne—You surprise me. Where, for instance?

Henpeck—Well, I can't reconcile the statement that Solomon was the wisest man with the further fact that he had so many wives.

PERSIFLAGE.

"What business are you in?" asked the social drummer. "I'm a gentleman, sir," replied Mr. Pimpous, coldly. "You don't say? Haven't been working at it long, have ye?"

THE WAY HE FELT.

Tom (dejectedly)—Miss Fidgett went back to Boston today. I professed to her at the dance last night and she rejected me. Dick—Yes, I saw you just after it happened. You saw me? You must have had a magnifying glass with you.

QUEER.

They say "Love's blind." Can that be right? Some mark in love? Are just a sight.

TRAUTMANS' HOME ROBBED OF JEWELS

Thieves Enter While Family Attends Trial of Woman Acquitted of Having Robbed Hogan and Carry Off Valuables.

NEW YORK, Dec. 28.—Dr. Alexander Trautman, whose wife was honorably discharged in Jefferson Market police court yesterday, on the charge brought by Peter J. Hogan that she was the woman who robbed him of \$12 in an alleyway on Fifth avenue Saturday night, today is mourning the loss of \$250 worth of valuables taken from their residence.

While Mrs. Trautman's case was being heard in court, thieves, taking advantage of the fact that all occupants of the residence were away, went through the house. A gold watch, diamond ring, diamond brooch, and other trinkets were taken.

Hogan, who was arrested on complaint of Mrs. Trautman's attorneys, following her discharge on a charge of assault and battery in having seized Mrs. Trautman and held her for a policeman, will not be prosecuted.

After her own release Mrs. Trautman decided to forgive the man who caused her so much trouble.

WAR VETERANS IN UNIFORM WILL GREET THE PRESIDENT

Commander Mitchell Issues Order to Camps of District Regarding White House Reception on New Year Day.

Commander J. Walter Mitchell, of the Department of the District, has issued an order to the local camps of Spanish War Veterans regarding the reception at the White House on Tuesday. Commander Mitchell requests that all the members attend in uniform if possible.

The order follows: Paragraph 1. The department commander desires to call the attention of the members of the organization to the annual reception given by the President of the United States to the United States War Veterans at the White House, Tuesday, January 1, 1907. This reception will take place at 12:30 p. m. sharp, and all comrades are requested to attend.

Paragraph 2. The department will assemble at Sixth and G streets north-west, at 11:00 a. m., and promptly at 11:30 will form on Sixth street, right resting on H; the camps taking position according to number, each camp under the command of its respective officers.

Paragraph 3. All comrades having uniforms will wear them, either service or Spanish War Veterans uniform, with forms will wear dark clothes, campaign hat, and white gloves.

Paragraph 4. Visiting comrades will take position with the aides at the head of the column.

Paragraph 5. Each camp commander immediately after passing the receiving party will dismiss his camp.

By order of J. WALTER MITCHELL, Department Commander.

WILLIAM PEACOCK, Department Adjutant.

BLAMES ROOSEVELT FOR HIS DEFEAT

NEW YORK, Dec. 28.—The Wadsworths, James W. sr., and James W. jr., the former defeated for re-election to Congress and the latter re-elected assemblyman for Livingston county, are at odds with President Roosevelt, according to reports.

Representative Wadsworth, it is stated, has not visited the White House since his defeat and Assemblyman Wadsworth has also abstained from his usual visits.

The story about the Wadsworths was told by Republicans, who say that, unless there is a change somewhere, Assemblyman Wadsworth's re-election as speaker of the assembly may be jeopardized.

The Republicans who told the story about the Wadsworths and their alleged differences with President Roosevelt said that Representative Wadsworth blames President Roosevelt for his defeat.

Gen. Grosvenor, Santa's Double, Gets "Touched"

Ohio Congressman's Snowy Locks and Beard Appeal to Madam Mercury.

It was Christmas Eve, and when Representative Grosvenor of Ohio, white-haired, white-bearded, and smiling, started down the aisle of the street car to alight, three messenger boys who were on the rear platform set up a howl.

"Look at old Santa Claus!" cried the smallest, and the shrillest of the trio, his remark given greater publicity by the appreciative laughter of his companions. General Grosvenor laughed, too, and so did everybody in the car.

"What is Santa Claus going to do for you?" asked the venerable Congressman, whose sarcasm is a dreaded thing on the floor of the House. The general said the boy.

The general, with some labor, fished in his pocket, but what he got out seemed to dissatisfy him. Perhaps it was either a penny or a nickel piece. He put it back into his pocket and got off the car. But the boy wasn't going to let that small coin escape.

He jumped from the car, followed the general to the curbstone, and, after a brief session with the general, ran and caught the car again.

In his hand gleamed a big silver coin. "Old Santa Claus" had been touched.

SENATE HESITATES ABOUT MORE PAY

Senate sentiment is not by any means unanimous in favor of adopting an amendment to the legislative, executive, and judicial bill to increase the salary of members of Congress from \$5,500 to \$7,500 a year. Doubt is expressed whether the Senate will favor such an increase. There is a disposition in the body to resent the plan of putting the burden of the initiative in this matter on the Senate, after House members have refused to assume the responsibility themselves.

The Senate appropriations subcommittee, which is holding daily sessions on the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, in hopes of getting it reported to the Senate soon after the recess, has not yet taken up the salary question. The members of the subcommittee are Senators Cullom, Warren, Wetmore, Teller, and Daniel.

After the bill is reported to the Senate, Senator Gallinger will offer his amendment to increase the salary of Senator to \$7,500.

Clerks May Get Something.

The Senate may conclude to change the House provision for clerks to House members, so as to make it \$1,500 a year, payable to the clerk and not to the member. Representative Dawson of Iowa sought to have a similar amendment adopted in the House but without result.

The Senate will also consider the question of allowance for mileage to clerks. Members of the Senate and Representatives say they require the service of their clerks during the recess at their homes, or wherever they may be, and that as free transportation is now impossible and clerks' salaries are low, a mileage allowance is needed.

MURDERER HELPS HIS EXECUTIONERS

LAS ANIMAS, Cal., Dec. 28.—Alphonse and Gaston were ruffians compared with the polite Lawrence Leberg, a self-confessed murderer. He acted as a reception committee to the mob that came to hang him. He heard his executioners making their way to his cell and calmly dressed himself for the gallows.

Forty masked men broke into the jail, seized Leberg, marched the man to a contrived telegraph pole, and hanged him. A large crowd of men and boys, who had waited outside the jail while their leaders were after Leberg, assisted in the hanging. The sheriff and two officers were overpowered by the mob and locked in a cell while Leberg was taken out.

PENNYPACKER'S PEN WRITES OUT MESSAGE

HARRISBURG, Pa., Dec. 28.—Governor Pennypacker wrote in longhand every line of his biennial message to the next Legislature. Then it was copied on a typewriter by stenographers and sent to the State printer. As a rule, former governors dictated their messages to a stenographer.

Pennypacker's message will be longer than usual. It will be transmitted to the senate and house Tuesday.

BOSTON PHONE FIGHT NOW UP TO COURTS

BOSTON, Dec. 28.—Boston's telephone fight is now up to the courts, Mayor Fitzgerald has voted the franchise granted by the Board of Aldermen to the Metropolitan Home Telephone Company, seeking to rival the old established Bell company here. The new company, however, declares that the veto came too late, and that its franchise is already operative. Even if the aldermen regain the franchise over the mayor's refusal, the Bell Company will attack the power of its competitor to open streets and erect poles without hearings in individual cases.

ADDITIONAL COUNSEL FOR WAGGAMAN ESTATE

Chief Justice Claybaugh yesterday authorized H. Rozier Dunay, trustee of the bankrupt estate of the late Thomas E. Waggoner, to employ J. J. Darlington, and William F. Mattingly as additional counsel, and to pay each \$200 as a retainer. Future compensation will be determined by the court. Darlington and Mattingly will co-operate with Sam Maddox and H. Prescott Gately, who have been acting as counsel for the trustee.

TURKEY BECOMES WHITE ELEPHANT

WEST CHESTER, Pa., Dec. 28.—A forty-five-pound turkey, which was disposed of here as a prize on Christmas Eve, has turned out to be a white elephant. Since then it has changed hands ten times, and the present owner says it is an elephant on his hands.

He cannot use it, neither can he sell it, because of its huge proportions. The bird is now to be disposed of by the eleventh time by raffle, and what the final disposition will be is the query of the hour.

HOTEL FOR WOMEN PROVES FAILURE

NEW YORK, Dec. 28.—Woman is to be deprived of her select place of refuge in New York city. The Martha Washington Hotel, hitherto closed to mere men, is soon to be opened to the use of those who have always been barred from ascending above the first floor.

This decision has been reached by the stockholders. Four years of trying to make the hotel pay by catering only to women patrons, without receiving a cent of dividends, has disgusted the stockholders.

Today they are looking for some one to lease the hotel at a figure which will give them some returns.